



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/790,712	03/03/2004	Mignard Francois	21029-00272-US	4299
30678	7590	02/21/2008	EXAMINER	
CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ LLP			ZHENG, LOIS L	
1875 EYE STREET, N.W.			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SUITE 1100			1793	
WASHINGTON, DC 20036				

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
02/21/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/790,712	FRANCOIS, MIGNARD	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	LOIS ZHENG	1793	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 November 2007.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 4-6 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 4-6 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ .	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .

Status of Claims

1. No claim amendments are made in view of applicant's response filed 28 November 2007. Therefore, claims 4-6 are currently under examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 4-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimizu et al. JP 2001-059133(Shimizu), and further in view of Delaunay et al. US 6,761,779 B2 (Delaunay).

The teachings of Shimizu in view of Delaunay are discussed in paragraph 8 of the previous Non-Final Office Action mailed 6 September 2007. The rejection ground is maintained for the same reasons as set forth in the previous Non-Final Office Action.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed 29 November 2007 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

In the remarks, applicant's argues that Delaunay is interested in limiting the oxidation to decrease the length of the complementary heating zone in a reducing atmosphere used downstream of the preheating zone. Delaunay is not teach controlling of the length of a steel band between the exit of the heating zone and the entrance of the galvanization furnace.

The examiner agrees that Delaunay teaches limiting the oxidization to decrease the length of the downstream complementary heating zone for cost reduction. However, Delaunay also teaches that the length of the preheating zone(i.e. oxidization treatment) can be varied to achieve optimum level of oxidization(col. 3 lines 3-11). One of ordinary skill in the art can derive, from the teachings of Delaunay, that the length of the preheating zone directly affects the level of oxidization. Therefore, the length of the preheating zone is a result effective variable. Base on this teaching, one of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to routinely optimize the length of the oxidation treatment zone in the continuous galvanizing process of Shimizu in order to achieve the desired amount of oxidization on the steel sheet surface before entering a reduction annealing surface.

Applicant further argues that the Delaunay is not concerned with regulate oxidation for high resistance steel having hardeners such as Si, Mn, Cr, Mo. etc. The manipulation of burners in combustion gas is very different from exposure in air according to the instant invention.

The examiner does not find applicant's argument persuasive because even though Delaunay's preheating zone achieves oxidization differently from the claimed invention, one of ordinary skill in the art would have still realized, from the teachings of Delaunay, that the length of the preheating zone(i.e. oxidization zone) is a result effective variable and can be manipulated to control the level of oxidation.

Conclusion

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lois Zheng whose telephone number is (571) 272-1248. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30am - 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Roy King can be reached on (571) 272-1244. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Roy King/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art
Unit 1742

LLZ